UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,069	03/31/2004	MIhai Florin Ionescu	53051/297278	5508

62296	7590	09/27/2006

GOOGLE / FENWICK
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA ST.
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
MYINT, DENNIS Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/814,069	IONESCU, MLHAI FLORIN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Myint	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 March 2004</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 March 2004</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/27/2004</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-36 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Sommerer et al. (hereinafter "Sommerer") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number

2004/0001104).

As per claim 1, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Figure 1 and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *allows a user*

to specify a text search parameter for the search to locate in previously visited web

pages);

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously entered"

(Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited*

web pages based on previous search queries, such as those search queries entered

into a web search engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web

search may be annotated with the search parameters used in the search.);

(c) "if the search query has been previously entered,

(i) retrieving a previously stored result set" (Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In ye*

another embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on

previous search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search

engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be

annotated with the search parameters used in the search); and

(ii) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result

set meets at least one condition" (Paragraph 0038, i.e., *Monty Hall, Monty Python,* and

Monty Python); and

(d) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set is determined to

meet the at least one condition, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set"

(Paragraph 0038, i.e., *can be returned by the browser sessions search*).

As per claim 2, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein (b) determining whether a search query has been previously entered

comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously entered search queries"

(Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited*

web pages based on previous search queries, such as those search queries entered

into a web search engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web

search may be annotated with the search parameters used in the search; and

Paragraph 0030, i.e., *other portions of the web page may also be searched, including*

*link authors, headings, captions, **query terms** associated with a search result page,*

etc., and whatever logical units (e.g., introductions, abstracts, reference lists, etc.) the

resource page may contain).

As per claim 3, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set

meets at least one condition comprises determining at least   one of the following:

determining the validity of a portion of the result set, determining that a portion of the

result set is new, determining that a portion of the result set includes a change,

determining that a new article exists in a category of the result set, determining that a

new article has been received in a category of the result set, determining that an article

has been changed in the result set, determining that a new e-mail has been received in

a category of the result set, determining that a new e-mail has been sent in a category

of the result set, determining that a new web page has been received in a category of

the result set, determining that a web page has been changed in a category of the

result set,   determining that a new document has been received in a category of the

result set, and determining that a new document has been generated in a category of

the result set" (Figure 7 and Paragraph 0066, i.e., *In one embodiment, a unique visit*

identifier 707 is also stored in the visit data structure 700. A unique visit identifier

incorporates a signature that uniquely identifies the contents of the accessed resource

page and is relevant in cases when the resource changes with time and the storage of

the newly retrieved, if only slightly changed, resource page content is required. The signature is used to verify whether the whole accessed page or any component thereof has been previously retrieved and stored in the archive for reuse).

As per claim 8, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles" (Paragraph 0027, i.e., *a visit data structure*).

As per claim 9, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

" wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query" (Paragraph 0034, i.e., *The search button 114 initiates the search based on the currently set parameters; and Paragraph 0038, i.e., In yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on previous search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be annotated with the search parameters used in the search).*

As per claim 10, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set comprises at least one of the following: a real-time event, a historical event, an indexable event, a non-indexable event" (Paragraphs 0005, 0006, 0007, 0028, 0030, i.e., *history list).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sommerer in view of Baidya et al., (hereinafter "Baidya") (U.S. Patent Application

Publication Number 2003/0046311).

As per claim 4, Sommerer does not explicitly teach the limitation: "wherein

determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set meets at least

one condition comprises determining whether a   preset amount of time has elapsed

from a time associated with the result set".

Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set

meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a   preset amount of time

has elapsed from a time associated with the result set" (Paragraph 0013, i.e.,

automatically updating the information; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously*

stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis; and Paragraph

0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050,

i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that*

periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak

InfoBase industry database; and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053,

Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059,

Paragraph 0065).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of .

ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Sommerer, which caches previously

visited web content, with the method of Baidya, which updates caches of web content

on periodic basis, so that the resultant method would determine whether a preset

amount of time has elapsed from a time associated with the result set. One would have

been motivated to do so because *there is a need for a method and system for*

automatically, or semi-atomically, categorizing and classifying large volumes of

information and keeping the information up to date so that it is current and reliable

(Baidya, Paragraph 0012).

As per claim 5, Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set

meets at least one condition comprises determining whether a preset amount of time

has elapsed from a date associated with the result set" (Paragraph 0013, i.e.,

automatically updating the information; Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously*

stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis; and Paragraph

0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050,

i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that*

periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak

InfoBase industry database; and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053,

Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059,

Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 6, Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein retrieving a previously stored result set comprises at least one of

the following: retrieving a result set from an optical disc, retrieving a result set from a

hard drive, retrieving a result set from an external data storage medium, retrieving a

result set from an external data storage reader, and retrieving a result set from   a data

store on the client-side" (Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions*).

As per claim 7, Sommerer in view of Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein (a) receiving a search query comprises at least one of the following: receiving a search query from a user operating an offline client-side device, receiving a search query from a user operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and instructions;* and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for information* **offline**).

7.   Claims 11, 13, 14, 15, 17-27, 29-31 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny et al., (hereinafter "Denny") (U.S. Patent Number 7082428).

As per claim 11, Sommerer in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0034, i.e., *The search button 114 initiates the search based on the currently set parameters;* and Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on previous search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be annotated with the search parameters used in the search*);

(d) "storing the result set and associated search query in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD*

containing data and instructions; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search for*

*information **offline***); and

(e) "indexing the result set and associated search query for subsequent retrieval

of the result set" (Sommerer, 0028, i.e., *Archived resource page content are indexed*

and annotated to be searchable; and Baidya, Paragraph 0050, i.e., *thereafter,*

categorize and index the information for storage in the InfoBase).

Sommerer in view of Baidya does not explicitly teach the limitations: (b)

"determining whether the search query has been previously entered"; and (c) "if the

search query has not been previously entered, receiving a result set";

Denny teaches the limitations:

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously entered" (Denny,

Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously*

executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to

the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the

previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is

executed against one or more data sources); and

(c) "if the search query has not been previously entered, receiving a result set"

(Denny, Abstract).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of comparing current queries to pervious

queries, as taught by Denny, to the method of Sommerer in view of Baidya so that the

resultant method would compare current queries to the previous queries. One would

have been motivated to do so in order to do away with *multiple duplicative searches*

(Denny, Column 1 Lines 62-67).

As per claim 13, Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether the search query has been previously entered

comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously entered search queries

13. The method of claim 11, wherein determining whether the search query has

been previously entered comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously

entered search queries" (Denny, Abstract).

As per claim 14, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein receiving a result set comprises performing a search for articles in

response to the search query" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0034, i.e., *The search button 114*

initiates the search based on the currently set parameters; and Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In*

yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on

previous search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search

engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be

annotated with the search parameters used in the search).

As per claim 15, Baidya teaches the limitation:

" wherein storing the result set and associated search query in an offline-

accessible data store comprises at least one of the following: storing the result set on an

optical disc, storing the result set on a hard drive, storing the result set on an external

data storage medium, storing the result set on an external data storage reader, and

storing the result set on a data store on the client-side" (Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak*

InfoBase CD containing data and instructions; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to*

*search for information **offline***).

As per claim 17, Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny

teaches the limitations:

(a) "program code for receiving a search query" (Sommerer, Figure 1 and

Paragraph 0030, i.e., *allows a user to specify a text search parameter for the search to*

locate in previously visited web pages);

(b) "program code for determining whether a search query has been previously

entered"(Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with*

the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is

substantially similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results

corresponding to the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is

found, the query is executed against one or more data sources);

(c) "program code for if the search query has been previously entered, retrieving a

result set from an offline data store and determining whether at least a portion of the

result set meets at least one condition" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0038, i.e., *In ye another*

embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on previous

search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search engine. For

example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be annotated with

the search parameters used in the search; and Baidya, Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak*

InfoBase CD containing data and instructions); and

(d) "program code for if the at least a portion of the result set meets the at least one

condition, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set" (Sommerer,

Paragraph 0038, i.e., *Monty Hall, Monty Python,* and *Monty Python;* and Paragraph

0038, i.e., *can be returned by the browser sessions search*).

As per claim 18, Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein (b) program code for determining whether a search query has been

previously entered comprises program code   for comparing the search query to a list

of previously entered search queries" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server*

compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application

server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application

server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no

substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data

sources).

As per claim 19, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein (c) program code for if the search query has been previously entered,

retrieving a result set from an offline data store and determining whether at least a

portion of the result set meets at least one condition comprises program code for

determining at least one of the following: determining the validity of a portion of the result set, determining that a portion of the result set is new, determining that a portion of the result set includes a change, determining that a new article exists in a category of the result set, determining that a new article has been received in a category of the result set, determining that an article has been changed in the result set, determining that a new e-mail has been received in a category of the result set, determining that a new e-mail has been sent in a category of the result set, determining that a new web page has been received in a category of the result set, determining that a web page has been changed in a category of the result set, determining that a new document has been received in a category of the result set, and determining that a new document has been generated in a category of the result set" (Figure 7 and Paragraph 0066, i.e., *In one embodiment, a unique visit identifier 707 is also stored in the visit data structure 700. A unique visit identifier incorporates a signature that uniquely identifies the contents of the accessed resource page and is relevant in cases when the resource changes with time and the storage of the newly retrieved, if only slightly changed, resource page content is required. The signature is used to verify whether the whole accessed page or any component thereof has been previously retrieved and stored in the archive for reuse).*

As per claim 20, Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein (c) program code for if the search query has been previously entered, retrieving a result set from an offline data store   and determining whether at least a

portion of the result set meets at least one condition comprises program code for determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed   from a time associated with the result set" (Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;* and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database;* and Paragraph 0051, Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057, Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 21, Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein (c) program code for if the search query has been previously entered, retrieving a result set from an offline data store   and determining whether at least a portion of the result set meets at least one condition comprises program code for determining whether a preset amount of time has elapsed   from a date associated with the result set" (Paragraph 0013, i.e., *automatically updating the information;* Paragraph 0020, i.e., *information previously stored in the InfoBase is automatically updated on a periodic basis;* and Paragraph 0023, i.e., *News information is updated daily by the BioNews Engine;* Paragraph 0050, i.e., *The Back-End processing Engine includes an automatic data-mining unit that periodically gathers information made available on the Internet to update the BioZak InfoBase industry database;* and Paragraph 0051,

Paragraph 0052, Paragraph 0053, Paragraph 0054, Paragraph 0055, Paragraph 0057,

Paragraph 0058, Paragraph 0059, Paragraph 0065).

As per claim 22, Baidya teaches the limitation:

" wherein (d) program code for if the search query has been previously entered,

retrieving a result set from an offline data store and determining whether at least a

portion of the result set meets at least one condition comprises at least one of the

following: program code for retrieving a result set from an optical disc, program code for

retrieving a result set from a hard drive, program code for retrieving a result set from an

external data storage medium, program code for retrieving a result set from an external

data storage reader, and program code for retrieving a result set from a data store on

the client-side" (Paragraph 0151, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase CD containing data and*

instructions).

As per claim 23, Baidya teaches the limitation:

"wherein (a) program code for receiving a search query comprises at least one of

the following: program code for receiving a search query from a user operating an

offline client-side device, program code for receiving a search query from a user

operating an online client-side device" (Baidya, Paragraph 0515, i.e., *a BioZak InfoBase*

CD containing data and instructions; and Paragraph 0151, i.e., *allows users to search*

*for information **offline**).*

As per claim 24, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set comprises at least one of the following: client-side articles, and network articles" (Paragraph 0027, i.e., *a visit data structure*).

As per claim 25, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein the search query comprises at least one of the following: an implicit query, an explicit query, both an implicit query and an explicit query" (Paragraph 0034, i.e., *The search button 114 initiates the search based on the currently set parameters; and Paragraph 0038, i.e., In yet another embodiment, a user may search previously visited web pages based on previous search queries, such as those search queries entered into a web search engine. For example, each archived web page associated with a web search may be annotated with the search parameters used in the search*).

As per claim 26, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein the previously stored result set comprises at least one of the following: a real-time event, a historical event, an indexable event, a non-indexable event" (Paragraphs 0005, 0006, 0007, 0028, 0030, i.e., *history list*).

Claim 27 is rejected on the same basis as claim 11.

Claim 29 is rejected on the same basis as claim 13.

Claim 30 is rejected on the same basis as claim 14.

Claim 31 is rejected on the same basis as claim 15.

As per claim 34, Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny
teaches the limitations:

(a) "receiving a search query" (Sommerer, Figure 1 and Paragraph 0030, i.e.,
allows a user to specify a text search parameter for the search to locate in previously
visited web pages) ;

(b) "determining whether the search query has been previously entered" (Denny,
Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously*
executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially similar to
the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to the
previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is
executed against one or more data sources);

(c) "if the search query has not been previously entered,

(i) receiving a result set" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server*
compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application
server finds a query that is substantially similar to the entered query, the application
server returns the results corresponding to the previously executed query. If no
substantially similar result is found, the query is executed against one or more data
sources);

(ii) "storing the result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya,
Paragraph 0151); and

(iii) "indexing the result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(d) "if the search query has been previously entered" (Denny, Abstract,),

(i) "determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored result set meets at least one condition" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0038, i.e., *Monty Hall, Monty Python,* and *Monty Python*);

(ii) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set meets at least one condition, outputting the portion of the previously stored result set" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0038, i.e., *Monty Hall, Monty Python,* and *Monty Python;* and Paragraph 0038, i.e., *can be returned by the browser sessions search*); and

(iii) "if the at least a portion of the previously stored result set does not meet the at least one condition,

(1) receiving a result set;

(2) storing the result set in an offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151); and

(3) "indexing the result set for subsequent retrieval" (Baidya, Paragraph 0151).

As per claim 35, Denny teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether a search query has been previously entered comprises comparing the search query to a list of previously entered search queries" (Denny, Abstract, i.e., *An application server compares an entered query with the previously executed queries. If the application server finds a query that is substantially*

similar to the entered query, the application server returns the results corresponding to

the previously executed query. If no substantially similar result is found, the query is

executed against one or more data sources).

As per claim 36, Sommerer teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining whether at least a portion of the previously stored

result set meets at least one condition comprises determining at least one of the

following: determining the validity of a portion of the result set, determining that a portion

of the result set is new, determining that a portion of the result set includes a change,

determining that a new article exists in a category of the result set, determining that a

new article has been received in a category of the result set, determining that an article

has been changed in the result set, determining that a new email has been received in a

category of the result set, determining that a new email has been sent in a category of

the result set, determining that a new web page has been received in a category of the

result set, determining that a web page has been changed in a category of the result

set, determining that a new document has been received in a category of the result set,

and determining that a new document has been generated in a category of the result

set" (Figure 7 and Paragraph 0066, i.e., *In one embodiment, a unique visit identifier*

707 is also stored in the visit data structure 700. A unique visit identifier incorporates a

signature that uniquely identifies the contents of the accessed resource page and is

relevant in cases when the resource changes with time and the storage of the newly

retrieved, if only slightly changed, resource page content is required. The signature is

used to verify whether the whole accessed page or any component thereof has been

previously retrieved and stored in the archive for reuse).

8.   Claims 12, 16, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny and further

in view Shaath et al., (hereinafter "Shaath") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number

20060010150).

As per claim 12, Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny does

not explicitly teach the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set".

Shaath teaches the limitation: "determining expiration data for the result set"

(Paragraph 0030, i.e., *it will expire;* Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;* and

Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date).*

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining expiration data, taught by

Shaath, to method of Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Denny so that

the resultant method would determine expiration data. One would have been motivated

to do so because determining expiration data is notoriously well know in the art.

As per claim 16, Shaath teaches the limitation:

"wherein (f) determining expiration data for the result set comprises determining

expiration data for at least a portion of the result set, and displaying the expiration data

for the at least a portion of the result set" (Shaath, Paragraph 0102, *expiration dates;*

and Paragraph0104, i.e. *To determine the expiration date;* and 0032, i.e., *completely*

transparent to the user).

Claim 28 is rejected on the same basis as claim 12.

Claim 32 is rejected on the same basis claim 16.

9.   Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sommerer in view of Baidya and further in view of Rivers-Moore et al, (hereinafter

"Rivers") (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0267813).

As per claim 33, Sommerer in view of Baidya teaches the limitations:

"receiving a request for an article in a result set from a client device, the article

accessible via a network" (Sommerer, Figure 1 and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *allows a user*

to specify a text search parameter for the search to locate in previously visited web

pages);

"determining whether the article meets at least one condition" (Sommerer,

Paragraph 0038, i.e., *Monty Hall, Monty Python,* and *Monty Python*);

"if the article does not meet at least one condition, retrieving the article via the

network" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0030, i.e., *allows a user to specify a text search*

parameter for the search to locate in previously visited web pages);

"retrieving the article via the network" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0054, i.e., *new*

visit);

"outputting the article on the client device" (Sommerer, Paragraph 0038, i.e., *can be returned by the browser sessions search*); and

"if the article is not stored in the offline-accessible data store" (Baidya, Paragraph 0050k i.e., *Back-End Processing Engine*). Note that most of Baidya's method and system are implemented online, i.e., data is not stored in offline-accessible. Only in Paragraph 0515, Baidya recites an alternative embodiment wherein data is stored in offline-accessible store.

Sommerer does in view of Baidya not explicitly teach the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device"; and "if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store";

Rivers teaches the limitations:

"determining whether the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store associated with the client device" (Paragraph 0088, i.e., *determine if the solution is available locally for offline use*); and

"if the article is stored in an offline-accessible data store"; and "retrieving the article from the offline-accessible data store" (Paragraph 0089, i.e., *to determine if the solution 124 is on the computer (cached or available offline) and access the solution*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of determining whether data is stored in an offline-accessible or not, as taught by Rivers, to the method and system of Sommerer in view of Baidya so that the resultant method and system would determine if the data is

stored in offline store or not. One would have been motivated to do so in order to

efficiently gather electronic information (Rivers, Paragraph 0011).

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure as follows.

    U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20020065800 (Morlitz)

    U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20030220913 (Doganata et al.,)

    U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20020103806 (Yamanoue)

    U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20040139106 (Bachman et al.,)

Contact Information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-5629.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dennis Myint   AU-2162

Cam U Truong
Primary Examiner